

# New emerging leadership theories and styles

Abdollah Sajjadi

Faculty member of Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch of Tehran

masoud karimkhani, Mohammad Mehrpour

PhD student financial management

**ABSTRACT** :Leadership is one of the most discussed and important topics in the social sciences especially in organizational theory and management. Generally leadership is the process of influencing group activities towards the achievement of goals. A lot of researches have been conducted in this area .some researchers investigated individual characteristics such as demographics, skills and abilities, and personality traits, predict leadership effectiveness. Different theories, leadership styles and models have been propounded to provide explanations on the leadership phenomenon and to help leaders influence their followers towards achieving organizational goals. Today with the change in organizations and business environment the leadership styles and theories have been changed. In this paper, we review the new leadership theories and styles that are new emerging and are according to the need of the organizations. Leadership styles and theories have been investigated to get the deep understanding of the new trends and theories of the leadership to help the managers and organizations choose appropriate style of leadership.

**key words:** new emerging styles, new theories, leadership, organization

## INTRODUCTION

Leadership is one of the most discussed and important topics in the social sciences (Avolio, Sosik, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Bass, 1990; Bennis, 2007). Khanka (2006) describes leadership generally as a process of influencing group activities towards the achievement of goals. A lot of researches have been conducted in this area .some researchers investigated individual characteristics such as demographics, skills and abilities, and personality traits, predict leadership effectiveness (e.g., Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Judge, Colbert, & Ilies, 2004; Mumford, Campion, & Morgeson, 2007).

Leadership has been studied in a variety of disciplinary fields from psychology, military, education, management to healthcare, and more recently in nursing. Yet within these fields, the most common conceptualizations of leadership include four elements as central to their definition: leadership (a) is a process, (b) entails influence, (c) occurs within a group setting or context, and (d) involves achieving goals that reflect a common vision (Hunt, 2004; Northouse, 2004; Shaw, 2007; Shortell and Kaluzny, 2006).

Different theories, leadership styles and models have been propounded to provide explanations on the leadership phenomenon and to help leaders influence their followers towards achieving organizational goals. Various theories of leadership, which include trait theory, behavioral theory, contingency theory, path-goal leadership theory, situational leadership theory, transactional leadership theory, and transformational leadership theory (Andriessen & Drenth, 1998; Boddy & Paton, 1998; Hodgetts & Luthans, 2000; Khanka, 2006; Ebert & Griffin, 2009) provide important insights about the nature of effective leadership (Chatterjee, Small, & Minkes, 1999; Yukl, 1999).

Today with the change in organizations and business environment the leadership styles and theories have been changed. In this paper, we review the new leadership theories and styles that are new emerging and are according to the needs of the organizations.

## LEADERSHIP THEORIES AND STYLES

A great deal of scholarship over the past 30 years has been devoted to the analysis and comparison of different leadership styles. There are different leadership styles .

Much of this work has dealt with transactional (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003), transformational (Bass et al., 2003), and charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987), whereas more recent work is beginning to address styles and approaches such as authentic (Avolio & Gardner, 2005), servant (Van Dierendonck, 2011), and responsible leadership (Waldman & Galvin, 2008).

Hodgetts and Luthans (2000) identify three leadership styles, comprising of authoritarian leadership, participative leadership and paternalistic leadership. Whereas Khanka (2006) also identity three leadership styles; autocratic or authoritative style, democratic or participative style, and laissez-faire or free-rein style. The difference between the two classifications is the replacement of paternalistic leadership in the former with free-rain style in the later classification. Ahmed (2010) combines the two classes to make four leadership styles; autocratic styles, democratic style, laissez faire style, and paternalistic style. These styles connote different leadership behaviors to achieve goals and keep the team.

The early leadership theories are basically, trait theory and behavioral theories. Early studies believed that leaders had some peculiar set of qualities or traits that distinguished them from their peers, rather than the situation in which the leader worked (Boddy & Paton 1998; Ebert & Griffin, 2009)

Some of the recent leadership theories include contingency/situational theories, charismatic theories, transactional theories, and transformational theories. Most of these theories were derived from the early leadership theories (Boddy & Paton, 1998; Andriessen & Drenth, 1998; Khanka, 2006; Ebert & Griffin, 2009).

Commonly used leadership theories including transformational leadership and more recently, emotionally intelligent leadership have guided leadership research and interventions, presumably due to their emphasis on relationships as the foundation for effecting positive change or outcomes (Hibberd and Smith, 2006).

relationally focused leadership styles include transformational leadership which motivates others to do more than they originally intended and often more than they thought possible (Bass and Avolio, 1994), individualized consideration, which focuses on understanding the needs of each follower and works continuously to get them to develop to their full potential (Avolio et al., 1999), and resonant leadership that inspires, coaches, develops and includes others even in the face of adversity (Boyatzis and McKee, 2005; Goleman et al., 2002).

The task focused (non-relationally focused) leadership styles are primarily management by exception, laissez-faire, transactional leadership, dissonant leadership styles, and instrumental leadership. Active Management-by-Exception focuses on monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels (Avolio, et al., 1999). Laissez-faire styles are similar in that they are conceptualized as passive avoidance of issues, decision making and accountability (Avolio et al., 1999). Passive-avoidant leadership tends to react only after problems have become serious to take corrective action, and often avoids making any decisions at all (Avolio et al., 1999). Transactional leadership emphasize the transaction or exchange that takes place among leaders, colleagues and followers to accomplish the work (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Dissonant leadership is characterized by pacesetting and commanding styles that undermine the emotional foundations required to support and promote staff success (Goleman et al., 2002). Instrumental leadership focuses on the strategic and task-oriented developmental functions of leaders (Antonakis and House, 2002). Initiating structure referred to the degree to which leaders articulate clear role expectations, create well defined communication channels and focus on tasks and attaining goals (Judge et al., 2004). in the following section some recent leadership theories are discussed with more details.

### ***Contingency/Situational theories***

Contingency/Situational theories draw attention to the situation in determining the most appropriate leadership style and assume that appropriate behavior of a leader varies from one situation to another (Ebert and Griffin, 2009).

### ***Charismatic leadership***

Charismatic leadership theories focus on how leaders are seen through the eyes of their followers. Charismatic leadership is a form of influence based on the leader's charisma, a form of interpersonal attraction that inspired support and acceptance (Ebert and Griffin, 2009).

### ***Transactional leadership***

Transactional theories of leadership entails managing the transactions between the Organization and its members so that the organizational objectives are achieved (Khanka, 2006). Transactional leadership is said to be essentially the same as management in that it involves routine, regimented activities (Ebert and Griffin, 2009)

### ***Transformational Leadership***

According to Hodgetts and Luttans (2000), transformational leaders are visionary agents with a mission who are capable of motivating their followers to accept new goals and new ways of doing things.

Over the last 30 years, transformational leadership has become one of the most prominent theories of organizational behavior. There are different schools of leadership theory in the literature, in which transformational leadership can be found amongst the contemporary perspectives (Keegan and Den Hartog, 2004; Turner and Mu"ller, 2005). Transformational leadership has been defined by the ability of the leader to create a shared vision and a strong identification with team members that is based on more than just rewarding completion of project activities (Bass, 1985; Keegan and Den Hartog, 2004)

Through this shared vision, the transformational leader is then able to mobilize commitment and transcendent performance of both the individual and the project as a whole. Such leaders are said to show charisma, as a means of motivating others to integrate into the collective vision, and a strong consideration of and support for individual team member needs (Keegan and Den Hartog, 2004). Developing connections between the leader and individual team members is also thought to help individuals achieve their full potential. As stated Parker and Craig (2008, p. 173) ". it is reasonable to surmise that in a project, transformational leadership can turn an ensemble of skilled, varied personnel into a multi-skilled, creative and synergized force accomplishing project goals with alacrity."

In contrast to leadership based on individual gain and the exchange of rewards for effort, transformational leaders direct and inspire employee effort by raising their awareness of the importance of organizational values and outcomes. In doing so, such leaders activate the higher-order needs of their employees and encourage them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization and its clientele. Research not only has validated the existence of transformational leadership but also consistently has linked the practice of these transformational leadership behaviors with employee performance and satisfaction (Bass and Riggio 2006; Dumdum, Lowe, and Avolio 2002; Trottier, Van Wart, and Wang 2008).

Given its emphasis on the importance of an organization's mission and outcomes, transformational leadership may be particularly useful in public and nonprofit organizations; as such organizations have strong service- and community-oriented missions. In fact, consistent with transformational leadership's emphasis on the motivating potential of organization mission, a key tenet of the literature on public employee motivation (Paarlberg and Perry 2007; Wright 2007) is that "the more engaging, attractive and worthwhile the mission is to people, the more the agency will be able to attract support from those people, to attract some of them to join the agency, and to motivate them to perform well in the agency" (Rainey and Steinbauer 1999, 16).

Transformational leaders use idealized influence, inspiration and motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration to achieve superior results (Avolio et al., 1999), and resonant styles are based on the emotional intelligence of the leaders (Boyatzis and McKee, 2005).

### ***implicit leadership theories***

Implicit theories represent a special form of cognitive schemata that—in analogy to scientific theories—are seen as a cognitive network of everyday concepts. With the help of such naive models people try to explain and predict their own behavior and that of others as well as derive their action strategies. General definitions of implicit leadership theories imply that they are cognitive structures containing the traits and behaviors of leaders (Kenney, Schwartz-Kenney, & Blascovich, 1996).

Examples for studies into implicit leadership theories include research focusing on the influence of performance information on the perception of leadership, thereby examining the social construction of leadership (see Lord & Maher, 1991, for an overview); the content of implicit leadership theories (e.g., Offermann, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994); the effect of implicit leadership theories on the perception of a

specific leader (e.g., Ensaria & Murphy, 2003; Shamir, 1992); and the effect of a fit between implicit leadership theories and actual leader behavior (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Nye, 2005; Nye & Forsyth, 1991). Leadership theorists have identified additional behavioral leadership styles that may potentially influence organizational performance on several dimensions. Among these are the authentic leadership approach and servant, spiritual, ethical, moral, responsible, and entrepreneurial styles.

### ***Servant leadership***

Servant leaders have been described as those who place the good of those being led over the self-interest of the leader. Such leaders are said to value and develop people, build community, and share power and status for the common good of each individual, the organization, and those served by the organization (Smith et al., 2004). They also lead by setting an example for others to follow and place emphasis on strong interpersonal relationships (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & enderson, 2008). This style may also be characterized by an altruistic mission to serve others and empathic sensitivity to their needs (Searle & Barbuto, 2011). This form of leadership also addresses the importance of multiple stakeholders. A conceptual model of servant leadership suggests that there are six main characteristics of servant leaders—empowering and developing people, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing direction, and stewardship (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Nonetheless, there may be definitional problems with the construct (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009).

servant leaders are more inclined toward egalitarianism and to create organizational cultures that are focused on the personal growth of the members, which has been referred to as a spiritual generative culture (Smith et al., 2004). A distinction between servant and transformational leadership is that the former is proposed to be more effective in stable environments that allow a developmental approach, whereas transformational leadership is needed in more dynamic environments (Smith et al., 2004).

Sivro (2012) suggested that the role of servant leadership in high-performance organizations showed differential influence on intermediate outcomes such as openness and action orientation, long-term orientation, and workforce quality, depending on whether the leader was in a formal or direct role. At the level of teams, a positive association has also been found between servant leadership and perceived team effectiveness (Irving & Longbotham, 2007).

### ***Responsible leadership***

A particularly relevant leadership style that has emerged from the ethics literature is that of the responsible leader. It has been argued that responsible leadership is distinct from other leadership constructs in that it draws on discourse ethics theory and views leadership as a leader–stakeholder interaction. Moreover, it does not view leadership effectiveness in terms of financial performance as a driver of leadership behavior, but rather as directed toward gaining legitimate solutions for all affected parties (Voegtlin, Patzer, & Scherer, 2012). A central theme of such leadership is the obligation to balance the needs of multiple stakeholders (Waldman & Galvin, 2008)

### ***Authentic leadership***

The past decade has seen a dramatic increase in scholarly interest in the topic of authentic leadership. In point view of George (2003, p. 12) Authentic leadership is an approach or root construct that can underlie other leadership styles. As such it can enable the effectiveness of the positive leadership styles (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Organizational behavior researchers have identified four dimensions that make up the authentic leadership approach. These include self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing (i.e., evaluating all pertinent data before making a decision; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). It has been proposed that authentic leadership promotes trusting relationships with followers (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005). Importantly, a measure of authentic leadership that incorporates these dimensions has been shown to have discriminant validity relative to related leadership constructs such as transformational and ethical leadership (Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

Authentic leadership is strongly linked with moral leadership (Ladkin & Taylor, 2010) and other values based frameworks, such as ethical and spiritual leadership.

Authentic leadership has also been described as being able to incorporate “transformational, charismatic, servant, spiritual or other forms of leadership” (Avolio & Gardner, 2005, p. 329).

Authentic leadership is positively related to intermediate outcomes, such as organizational citizenship behaviors, follower satisfaction (Walumbwa et al., 2008), organizational commitment (Walumbwa et al., 2008), and trust in leadership (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009; Walumbwa et al., 2008; C. A. Wong & Cummings, 2009). Authentic leaders use their natural abilities, but they also recognize their shortcomings, and work hard to overcome them. They lead with purpose, meaning, and values. They build enduring relationships with people. Others follow them because they know where they stand. They are consistent and self-disciplined. When their principles are tested, they refuse to compromise. Authentic leaders are dedicated to developing themselves because they know that becoming a leader takes a lifetime of personal growth. Walumbwa et al. (2008, p. 94) defines authentic leadership as a pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development.” Authentic leadership is “a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development” (Avolio & Gardner, 2005, p. 321).

“Goldman and Kernis (2002) described relational authenticity as ‘involving valuing and achieving openness and truthfulness in one’s close relationships ...and the development of mutual intimacy and trust’ (p. 19). Based on this definition, Ilies et al. (2005) proposed that leaders with a relational authenticity will strive for open and truthful relationships with their followers and such orientation will have a number of positive outcomes. Authentic leaders display four types of behaviors. These include balanced processing, internalized moral perspective, relational transparency, and self-awareness” (p. 902; from Gardner, Avolio, Luthans et al., 2005; Gardner et al., 2005a, 2005b; Ilies et al., 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Wong et al. (2010) indicates that Authentic leadership focuses on the positive role modeling of honesty, integrity and high ethical standards in the development of leader–follower relationships” (p. 890).

### ***Neo-charismatic leadership***

The term neo-charismatic leadership approaches was coined by House and Aditya (1997) to describe a newly emerging leadership paradigm that encompasses theories of charismatic, transformational, and visionary leadership. As previously noted, Bass and Steidlmeier’s (1999) discussion of authentic transformational leadership served as a stimulus for interest in the construct of AL. Similarly, Luthans and Avolio (2003) readily acknowledged the influence of transformational leadership on their conception of AL. As the field has matured, sharper distinctions between authentic and transformational leadership have been drawn. For example, Avolio and Gardner (2005) describe AL as a root construct that serves as the basis for all forms of positive leadership. They go on to assert that AL “can incorporate transformational, charismatic, servant, spiritual or other forms of leadership. However, in contrast to transformational leadership in particular, authentic leadership may or may not be charismatic” (p. 329). Furthermore, Walumbwa and colleagues (2008) demonstrated that the ALQ accounts for variance beyond measures of transformational (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, MLQ, Form 5x; Bass & Avolio, 1993) and ethical leadership (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005), thereby providing evidence for the discriminant validity of the AL construct. As such, perhaps it is not surprising that relatively few (eight) AL Publications identify neo-charismatic leadership theories as foundational, despite the early association of the constructs.

### ***Ethical leadership***

Ethical leadership is defined as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005, p. 120). In proposing the theory of ethical leadership, Brown et al. (2005) suggested

that ethical leadership behavior plays an important role in promoting enhanced employee attitudes and behaviors. In support, prior work has linked ethical leadership to pro social and negatively deviant behaviors (e.g., Avey, Palanski, & Walumbwa, 2010)

### ***Distributed leadership***

Distributed leadership has become a popular 'post-heroic' (Badaracco 2001) representation of leadership which has encouraged a shift in focus from the attributes and behaviors of individual 'leaders' (as promoted within traditional trait, situational, style and transformational theories of leadership – (see Northouse 2007 for a review) to a more systemic perspective, whereby 'leadership' is conceived of as a collective social process emerging through the interactions of multiple actors (Uhl-Bien 2006). From this perspective, it is argued: Distributed leadership is not something 'done' by an individual 'to' others, or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization . . . [it] is a group activity that works through and within relationships, rather than individual action. (Bennett *et al.* 2003, p. 3) In a review of the literature on DL (including the associated concepts of 'delegated', 'democratic', and 'dispersed' leadership), though, Bennett *et al.* (2003, p. 7) did manage to identify three premises that seem to be shared by most authors: 1. 'Leadership is an emerging property of a group or network of interacting individuals' 2. 'There is openness to the boundaries of leadership' 3. 'Varieties of expertise are distributed across the many, not the few.' Spillane and Diamond (2007a, pp. 149–152) dispel four common 'myths of distributed leadership' as follows: (1) that DL is a blueprint for leadership and management; (2) that DL negates the role of school principals (or CEOs elsewhere); (3) that from a distributed perspective, everyone is a leader; and (4) that DL is only about collaborative situations.

### ***Entrepreneurial leadership***

Entrepreneurial leadership in a business gains its formal legitimization from the leader's status, profession, and leadership capabilities (Guo, 2009). However, while the position of the leader legitimizes entrepreneurial leadership, this kind of leadership cannot be based solely on power and hierarchy. Instead of a hierarchical chain of command and control, entrepreneurial leadership is based on individual skills such as achieving goals innovatively and collecting the requisite resources (Skodvin and Andresen, 2006). Entrepreneurial leaders are able to recognize opportunities and evaluate them through increasing the flow of information. (Hansson and Mønsted, 2008). This can manifest itself in the form of entrepreneurial vision, which seems to lead to performance and growth when strategy mediates their relationship. (Ruvio *et al.*, 2010). In this way, through risk taking and initiatives, entrepreneurial leadership aims to create innovations, (D'Intino *et al.*, 2008). Entrepreneurial leaders are able to work in any organization and in any task, by leading individuals and teams entrepreneurially, and by managing resources productively (Young, 1991). Leaders with entrepreneurial skills and characteristics may possess what it takes to become an entrepreneurial leader. Being an entrepreneurial leader as an employed manager is close to intrapreneurship and being an intrapreneur. These two concepts may overlap somewhat since intrapreneurs are frequently seen in leading positions in entrepreneurial projects and in new initiatives in companies. There is a need to distinguish two categories of entrepreneurial leadership: entrepreneurs who are leaders and leaders who possess an entrepreneurial leadership style without being entrepreneurs themselves. Any individual with an entrepreneurial leadership style in any organization can be deemed an entrepreneurial leader. Chen (2007) states, that risk-taking, pro-activeness, and innovativeness characterize entrepreneurial leadership when it is defined as entrepreneurs' way of leading in new ventures. Entrepreneurial leadership is needed in coping with uncertainty. Entrepreneurs in different contexts, such as industry, business ideas, and culture, are able to create a leadership style which enables them to survive in a situation where resources are scarce. Offering encouragement through one's entrepreneurial vision in daily routines is typical of an entrepreneur's way of leading an owner-managed business (Witt, 1998). Encouraging and motivating others, and showing an example of "how to do it" is typical of the leadership shown by entrepreneurs. In small businesses, entrepreneurial leadership is often rooted in a single decision maker. Entrepreneurs influence the business culture and its characteristics by their daily operational actions. According to Gupta *et al.* (2004, p. 254), "Both entrepreneurial leadership and team-oriented leadership require an ability to be effective at bargaining and team building.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Different theories, leadership styles and models have been propounded to provide explanations on the leadership phenomenon and to help leaders influence their followers towards achieving organizational goals. Today with the

change in organizations and business environment, the leadership styles and theories have been changed. In this paper, we review the new leadership theories and styles that are new emerging and are according to the need of the organizations.

A great deal of scholarship over the past 30 years has been devoted to the analysis and comparison of different leadership styles. There are different leadership styles .

Much of this work has dealt with transactional (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003), transformational (Bass et al., 2003), and charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987), whereas more recent work is beginning to address styles and approaches such as authentic (Avolio & Gardner, 2005), servant (Van Dierendonck, 2011), responsible leadership (Waldman & Galvin, 2008) and entrepreneurial leadership (Skodvin and Andresen, 2006)., Ethical leadership (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005, p. 120).

In this paper we investigated these leadership theories and styles. In the today's dynamic and changing business and organizational environment each of these styles and theories of leadership tries to help organizations get their goals and become competitive and successful. Managers and leaders of organization should choose the appropriate leadership style according to the organization conditions and needs to survive and be successful.

## REFERENCES

- Andriessen, E. J., & Drenth, P.J.D. (1998). Leadership: theories and models. In P. J. Drenth, *A Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2nd edition (pp. 321 - 335). United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- Antonakis, J., House, R.J., 2002. An analysis of the full-range leadership theory: the way forward. In: Avolio, B.J., Yammarino, F.J. (Eds.), *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead*. JAI Press, Amsterdam, pp. 3–33.
- Avey, J. B., Palanski, M. E., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2010). When leadership goes unnoticed: The moderating role of follower self-esteem on the relationship between ethical leadership and follower behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., Jung, D.I., 1999. Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 72 (4), 441–462.
- Avolio BJ, Sosik JJ, Jung DI, Berson Y. (2003). Leadership models, methods, and applications: Small steps and giant leaps. In Borman WC, Klimoski R, Ilgen DR, Weiner B (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 277–307). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315–338.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, J. T. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449.
- Badaracco, J.L. (2001). We don't need another hero. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(8), pp. 120–126.
- Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., 1994. *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207–218.
- Bass BM. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3 ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). *Manual: The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press
- Bass, Bernard M., and Ronald E. Riggio. 2006. *Transformational Leadership*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181–217.
- Bennis WG. (2007). The challenges of leadership in the modern world—Introduction to the special issue. *American Psychologist*, 62, 2–5.
- Bennett, N., Wise, C., Woods, P.A. and Harvey, J.A. (2003). *Distributed Leadership*. Nottingham: National College of School Leadership
- Boddy, D., & Paton, D. (1998). *Management: A Introduction*. Great Britain: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Boyatzis, R., McKee, A., 2005. *Resonant Leadership*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston
- Clapp-Smith, R., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Avey, J. B. (2009). Authentic leadership and positive psychological capital. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15, 227–240.
- Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, 117–134.
- Chatterjee, S. R., Small, M.W., & Minkes, A. L. (1999). Leadership and business ethics: Does it matter? Implication for management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 20, 327–335.
- Chen, M-H. (2007). "Entrepreneurial leadership and new ventures: creativity in entrepreneurial teams", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, Vol. 3 No. 16, pp. 239–49.
- D'Intino, R.S., Boyles, T., Neck, C.P. and Hall, J.R. (2008), "Visionary entrepreneurial leadership in the aircraft industry. The Boeing company legacy", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 39–54.
- Eagly AH, Karau SJ, Makhijani MG. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 125–145.
- Dumdum, Uldarico R., Ilies B. Lowe, and Bruce J. Avolio. 2002. Meta-Analysis of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Update and Extension. In *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead*, edited by Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 35–65. New York: JAI Press.
- Ebert, R. J., & Griffin, R. W. (2009). *Business Essentials*, 7th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Judge TA, Bono JE, Ilies B, Gerhardt MW. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765–780.
- Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F., Ilies, R., 2004. The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89 (1), 36–51.
- Ensaria, N., & Murphy, S. E. (2003). Cross-cultural variations in leadership perceptions and attribution of charisma to the leader. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 92, 52–66.

- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005). From ideal to real: A longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 659-676.
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 343-371.
- Gardner, W. L., Cogiliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1120-1145.
- George, W. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Judge TA, Colbert AE, Ilies R. (2004). Intelligence and leadership: A quantitative review and test of theoretical propositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 542-552.
- Goldman, B. M., & Kernis, M. H. (2002). The role of authenticity in healthy functioning and subjective well-being. *Annals of the American Psychotherapy Association*, 5(6), 18-20
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., McKee, A., 2002. *The New Leaders: Transforming the Art of Leadership into the Science of Results*. Little, Brown, London, England.
- Guo, K.L. (2009), "Core competencies of the entrepreneurial leader in health care organizations", *The Health Care Manager*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 19-29.
- Gupta, V., MacMillan, I.C. and Surie, G. (2004), "Entrepreneurial leadership: developing and measuring a cross-cultural construct", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 241-60.
- Keegan, A. and Den Hartog, D. (2004), "Transformational leadership in a project-based environment: a comparative study of the leadership styles of project managers and line managers", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 22 No. 8, pp. 609-17.
- Kenney, R. A., Schwartz-Kenney, B. M., & Blascovich, J. (1996). Implicit leadership theories: Defining leaders described as worthy of influence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 1128-1143.
- Khanka, S. S. (2006). *Organisational Behaviour*. New Delhi: S. Chand & Company Ltd.
- Ladkin, D., & Taylor, S. S. (2010). Enacting the "true self": Towards a theory of embodied authentic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 64-74.
- Liden, R. J., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 161-177.
- Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1993). *Leadership and information processing*. London: Routledge.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership development. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 241-261). San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.
- Hansson, F. and Mønsted, M. (2008), "Research leadership as entrepreneurial organizing for research", *Higher Education*, Vol. 55 No. 6, pp. 651-70.
- Hibberd, J.M., Smith, D.L., Wylie, D.M., 2006. In: Hibberd, J., Smith, D. (Eds.), *Leadership and Leaders. Nursing Leadership and Management in Canada*. 3rd ed. Elsevier Canada, Toronto, ON, pp. 369-394.
- Hodgetts, R. M., & Luthans, F. (2000). *International Management: Culture, Strategy, and Behavior*. United States of America: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409-473.
- Hunt, J.G., 2004. In: Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A.T., Sternberg, R.J. (Eds.), *What is Leadership? The Nature of Leadership*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 19-47.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader-follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 373-394.
- Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. J. (2007). Team effectiveness and six essential servant leadership themes: A regression model based on the items in the Organizational Leadership Assessment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2, 98-113.
- Mumford TV, Campion MA, Morgeson FP. (2007). The leadership skills strataplex: Leadership skill requirements across organizational levels. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 154-166.
- Northouse, P.G., 2004. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 3rd ed. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Northouse, P.G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 4th edn. London: Sage.
- Nye, J. L. (2005). Implicit theories and leadership perceptions in the thick of it: The effects of prototype matching, group setbacks, and group outcomes. In B. Schyns & J. R. Meindl (Eds.), *The leadership horizon series: Implicit leadership theories—Essays and explorations* (Vol. 3, pp. 39-61). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Nye, J. L., & Forsyth, D. R. (1991). The effects of prototype-based biases on leadership appraisals: A test of leadership categorization theory. *Small Group Research*, 22, 360-375.
- Offermann, L. R., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 43-58.
- Paarlberg, Laurie E., and James L. Perry. 2007. Values Management: Aligning Individual Values and Organizational Goals. *American Review of Public Administration* 37(4): 387-408.
- Parker, D.W. and Craig, M. (2008), "Leadership and interpersonal skills", *Managing Projects, Managing People*, Palgrave-Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Rainey, Hal G., and Paula Steinbauer. 1999. Galloping Elephants: Developing Elements of a Theory of Effective Government Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 9(1): 1-32.
- Ruvio, A., Rosenblatt, Z. and Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2010), "Entrepreneurial leadership vision in nonprofit vs for-profit organizations", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 144-58.
- Searle, T. P., & Barbuto, J. E., Jr. (2011). Servant leadership hope, and organizational virtuousness: A framework exploring positive micro and macro behaviors and performance impact. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18, 107-117.
- Skodvin, T. and Andresen, S. (2006), "Leadership revisited", *Global Environmental Politics*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 13-27.
- Shamir, B. (1992). Attribution of influence and charisma to the leader: The Romance of leadership revisited. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 386-407.
- Shaw, S., 2007. *Nursing Leadership*. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK.
- Shortell, S.M., Kaluzny, A.D., 2006. *Health Care Management: Organization Design and Behavior*, 5th ed. Delmar Publishers, Albany, NY.
- Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 80-91.



- Spillane, J. and Diamond, J.B. (2007a). *Distributed Leadership in Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Trotter, Tracey, Montgomery Van Wart, and XiaoHu Wang. 2008. Examining the Nature and Significance of Leadership in Government Organizations. *Public Administration Review* 68(2): 319–33.
- Turner, R. and Mueller, R. (2005), "The project manager's leadership style as a success factor on projects: a literature review", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 49-61.
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, pp. 654–676.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership. A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1228-1261.
- Voegtlin, C., Patzer, M., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). Responsible leadership in global business: A new approach to leadership and its multi-level outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105, 1-16.
- Waldman, D. A., & Galvin, B. M. (2008). Alternative perspectives of responsible leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 37, 327-341.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, 89-126.
- Wong, C. A., & Cummings, G. G. (2009). The influence of authentic leadership behaviors on trust and work outcomes of health care staff. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3, 6-23.
- Wong, C. A., Spence Laschinger, H. K., & Cummings, G. G. (2010). Authentic leadership and nurses' voice behaviour and perceptions of care quality. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18, 889–900.
- Witt, U. (1998), "Imagination and leadership – the neglected dimension of an evolutionary theory of the firm", *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 161-77.
- Wright, Bradley E. 2007. Public Service and Motivation: Does Mission Matter? *Public Administration Review* 67(1): 54–64.
- Young, O.R. (1991), "Political leadership and regime formation: on the development of institutions in international society", *International Organization*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 281-308.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 33-41.